

To: Charles Batts[cwbatts@att.net]; arthurfeinstein@earthlink.net[arthurfeinstein@earthlink.net];
pensted@hotmail.com[pensted@hotmail.com]; jlavelle@sfwater.org[jlavelle@sfwater.org];
jandrew@water.ca.gov[jandrew@water.ca.gov]; Ziegler, Sam[Ziegler.Sam@epa.gov];
michael.monroe247@gmail.com[michael.monroe247@gmail.com];
maval@pw.cccounty.us[maval@pw.cccounty.us]; janiac@yahoo.com[janiac@yahoo.com];
jakelly@waterboards.ca.gov[jakelly@waterboards.ca.gov]; Darcie Luce[friendsofsfestuary@gmail.com];
Barbara Salzman[bsalzman@att.net]
From: rjmorat@gmail.com
Sent: Mon 8/5/2013 4:01:41 AM
Subject: I am confused and lost

I like what Art wrote in his hand but I cannot agree with it, close only counts in horseshoes. I basically agree with the points but....

why not let a proposal fly at the Rose foundation simply by "telling them what kind of a BDCP would be acceptable to us?" Much easier to say what is needed rather than how to fix a screwed up process.

As for twin tunnels, or any other diversion plan, why not "we may take a position when the scope, operation, environmental impacts, costs and financing terms are given and universally accepted by scientists"?.

Rick